

1428 SOUTH JONES BOULEVARD LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89146 RECEIVED CITY CLERK

2006 OCT -4 A 10: 40

(702) 733-0036 FAX (702) 733-1774

STEVEN M. SHINN SSHINN@H-DLAW.COM

September 29, 2006

City Clerk, 1<sup>st</sup> Floor City Hall 400 Stewart Avenue Las Vegas, Nevada 89101

Protest

RE: Var-14313; Applicant; Dennis Iwasaka; Owner Max Jones Professional Plaza

Dear Sirs and Mesdames:

The undersigned represents 1428 Associates, LLC who is the owner of property situated at 1428 South Jones Boulevard which is adjacent to the property which is the subject of the Variance.

 $(1+i)_{\Lambda} (1+i)_{\Lambda} (1+i$ 

The undersigned wishes to take this opportunity to oppose the variance. The owner of said property has made many requests of the Alexander Office Park Association. Aside from these more personal irritating factors, the development will be able to house more than its fair share of occupants. This will increase the traffic in the area which already is congested and is projected to increase substantially with the opening of the new mental health facility on Jones and Oakey. The occupants of the Alexander Office complex have to travel to Jones and Oakey to access their property due to the absence of a left turn lane on Jones. Further, the owners of the subject property have for the last year, run an illegal junk yard on the property filled with numerous dogs, which have jumped over the wall and crapped on our property. The property owners have failed to maintain the health of the dogs; one loose pit bull who was hobbling along with a broken leg was taken away by Animal Control just over a week ago. Many believe that the tenants of said property have been illegally running a dog breeding business. They have stolen water from our property, many times, by connecting a hose to a spigot on our property (the most recent occurrence having happened just today). To say the least, they have shown no consideration or regard for the property of others, much less their own junk filled area.



Page 2

Letter to City Council

Re: Var-14313

Any variance should only be granted in the case of a land use hardship. There is no land use hardship in the instant case and they should be made to comply withal existing requirements including the 105 foot set back and existing density and landscape requirements. All of the other owners who attended the meeting share the same sentiment.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at the above-listed number.

Sincerely,

STEVEN M. SHINN, ESQ.

SMS/sy cc. Association